Previous references.

1906-07
(Prisons)

Pris **File No.** 40 — 06

Serial Nos. 1 to 3

Later references.

pris 40 of 06-07.
88 4+5.
13 March 07
Pris 6-07. 1-2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 3

Part B. for March 1907

SUBJECT.

Over detention of prisoner Siddegowda in the Bangalore Central Jail

---

Contents

1 From the Inspector General of Prisons to Govt.
No 1416/J dt 1.10.1906.

Forwards for the information of Govt. a file of papers regarding the over detention of the above prisoner under the circumstances stated therein and communicates the punishment awarded by him to the officials concerned in his over detention.

G. R. S. 58.

2 From the Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore.
with reference to the above letter

forwarded to them by the Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore, forwarding a copy of letter No 1040-194 & 22 9. 1906, from the Sessions Judge of Mysore showing the inconsistencies in the facts set out in para 5 of Col Smyth's letter (Sl 1.).

3. Govt. Prop. No 92644-5 & 28 2 1907 to the Inspector General of Prisons and the Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore.

Animadverts on the conduct of the jail officials for having over detained the prisoner for 37 days and directs that Mr. McSwine be suspended for 3 months and debarred from further promotions and Sivaraja and Lakshmana Rao be also suspended for 3 months and reduced to the next lower grade and communicates the severest displeasure of Govt to the Superintendent of the Central jail

G.R.S. 11] 1906.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Prisons)

NOTES.

File No. 40 of 06

File Heading.

Detention of prisoner no: 9590, Sidde Gowda in the Bangalore Central gail.

From

The Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore.

No. 1416/J Dated 1.10.06 Received 3.10.06

Diary No. 9828	Enclos. one file Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

Brief Abstract of Letter.

Forwards for information of Govt a file of papers regarding the over-detention of prisoner no: 9590 Sidde Gowda in the Bangalore Central gail under the circumstances stated therein & communicates the punishment he has awarded to the persons concerned in the said gail.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Subd for orders
CRW
4.10.06 SW
12/10/06

The following letter was received subsequently and subd for orders.

Notes—First sheet.

GPB--30,000—20-3-06.

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Ry: File No. 40 of 1906

Serial No.	
2	From The Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore - No 1923/108 D 10.10.06 With reference to ~~the~~ the H.P. of Prisons letter no: 11,16/J D 1.10.06 a copy of which was forwarded to him, forwards copy of letter no 1040/1914 D 22.9.06 from the Sessions judge of Mysore showing the inconsistency in the facts set out in para 5 of Col. Smyth's letter C.S. no. 1 above). Submitted. 3 The Inspector-General accepts that a serious mistake was committed by the officials of the office of the Supdt: of the B.B. gaol, and at the same time remarks that the releasing court also committed the omission of not enquiring why the usual certificate of release was not sent by the Supdt & whether their order of the 6th August had been given effect to - But this is denied by the releasing court - May the records be sent for? 12.10.06

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12}
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

For File No. 40 of 1906.

Serial No.

4 Not necessary to call for rents. Perhaps Mysore + Madras Jail Manuals to Prisons' ku 14.10.06

5 Subd with Madras & Mysore Jail Manuals.
SV
19/10/06

6 The prisoner has been illegally detained for 37 days, through the neglect of the jail officials — viz. the Jailer, Head Clerk Suraffa & Munshi Lakshmanarao. Although the Assistant Sessions Judge drew the attention of the Superintendent to the fact that the prisoner was ordered to be immediately released, the jail officials persisted in saying that the prisoner's sentence was only suspended. The I.G. of prisons tries to throw part of the blame on the Sessions Court. It is no doubt true that the Courts are also bound to see that their orders are executed, but in the present case there is no such excuse as ~~the Courts~~ there was direct making entry from the Sessions Judge but also from the Asstt. Sessions Judge.

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12j
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 40 of 1906-07

Serial No.

7. The I. G. of Prisons has censured the jailor and fined the Head Clerk and Munshi each one month's pay. The punishment awarded appears to be extremely inadequate.

8. 3. There is a full time Supt for the Jail and the Govt. may reasonably expect that he should pay some attention to details. The explanation of the Superintendent that he was misled by the clerks is not worthy of acceptance as there was nothing to prevent him from verifying the facts himself. Considering the gravity of the mistake that has been made, the Supt's claim, is so grave a character that the displeasure of Govt should, I submit, be communicated to the Superintendent

(Seen)
9 I fully agree - Please put up a draft - H 13.11.06

10 Perhaps reply on the above lines

Draft ready 28/11

H 29/11

H 30/11

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

For File No. 40 of 1906.

Serial No.

To the Hon'ble the Secretary to Govt.
2 Encls
Cu 3/12

This is a striking instance of the scandalous state of things in the Bangalore Central Jail. The Sessions Judge of Mysore sends an order directing the immediate release of a prisoner whose sentence had already been suspended but the order is trifled with and tossed about from one person to another and no effect is given to it for 37 days. In the meantime a requisition is received from the Asst Sessions Judge recalling the warrant

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

of imprisonment. Even then the jail authorities did not wake up to their faults. It was not till the Sessions Judge on the instance of the Asstt Sessions Judge, called on the Supdt of the Central Jail to explain why the prisoner had not been released that the error was discovered and the man was at once set free. A more flagrant case of culpable carelessness & mismanagement could not be conceived and it is aggravated by the circumstance that a prisoner ordered

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

Serial No.

to be released was
illegally detained for
37 days. To prevent
a recurrence of this
irresponsible state of
things, the best course
seems to be to order
the prosecution of the
Chief Jail Official
responsible for the
detention. From the
record I gather that
he is Surgeon, the
acting Dy Jailer.
If prosecution is consi-
dered undesirable,
he should at least
be dismissed the service
as a warning to others
As Chief Jailer McGu
is unworthy of any respon
sible

GPB—50,000—23-10-05

Serial No.

path. He has since been
remented to Deputy Jailor
ship. He may be fined
one month's pay and
severely censured.

12 Next to Surappa,
Munshi Lakshmanna
is the person much to blame
in this affair. He did
not exercise even ordinary
care in the discharge of
his duties. He mistook
"suspended" for "released"
Such a man is unfit
to be retained in service
& ought to be dismissed.
If dismissal is considered
too severe a punishment
he ought to be at least
degraded permanently.
The Supdt of the Jail

GPB—50,000—23 10-05

G.I.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

cannot heal together absolve from blame. His Superior must have been very slack for such an untoward incident to have happened. Perhaps he relied too much on Surapher & did not take the trouble to verify things for himself. It will be sufficient to communicate to him the displeasure of Govt for the lax manner in which things are permitted to be done in the Dist.

H W Nethersole
2d Dec 1905.

13 Col Smyth's letter is dated 1st Dec and this file comes to me on 3d Dec.

4/12/05

GPB—50,000—23 10-05

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 108 of 1906-07

Serial No.

14 Please pencil the draft suitably & submit

WS 5/12/06

Draft and Memo 6/12/06 Secy) WS 7/12/06

15 Vide my pencil query against para 4 of the draft. Fill in particulars, & resubmit the draft to the Secy Committee for orders before submitting to Govt.

WS 11/12/06

16 Please fill in the particulars & send the file back to me

WS 11/12/06

Secy

17 Please see the pencil entry of the Offg Secy 11/12/06 18 Put up with a Do letter to the Surgeon General

WS 11/12/06

19 Draft-Memo 13/12 20. Passed WS 13/12/06

GPB—50,000—23 10·05

11 Bangalore
13th December 06.

Sir
I.O

Dear Sir,

21 The information as to the post regt lower in rank to that of Head Munshi in the Central Jail, Bangalore, is not readily forthcoming in this office and is urgently wanted for the disposal of a reference pending here. I am therefore to request the favor of your furnishing me with this information as well as the pay attached thereto as early as convenient.

I
I have &c.
18/12/06

To
Major H.E. Drake Brockman I.M.S
C/I/C Dept of Jails & Prisons

g 1637 D/13/14/12/06

SM 13/12 HC

Mr
13/12

11 Bangalore
13th December 06.

Dist.
D.O.

Dear Sir,

21 I am informed as to the post master in charge of Head Quarters in the Central Jail, Bangalore, is not reading and coming in this office and to urgently wanted for the disposal of a reference pending here. I am therefore to request the favour of [illegible]

No/1637 dt/ 13/14/12/06

23 Sir
This information
was wanted by
him when in the
draft - relating
to the dismissal
of some of the
officers in the
Central Jail in
connection with the
over-detention of
a prisoner - Please
attach necessary
to the draft - & send the
draft on some day

14/12/46

24

The file sent

14/12/46

J 1457

D. O. No 17.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF PRISONS
IN MYSORE.

Bangalore 14th December 1946.

Dear sir,

22 In reply to your D.O. of yesterday's date, I have to state that there is no "Head Munshi's" post in the Central Jail, Bangalore. There is one post of simply "Munshi" with 20 Rs/- pay attached thereto. The post next lower in rank to it is that of a "Deputy Munshi" with a pay of 15 Rs/- attached to it.

Yours truly
H E Arnold Brockman
Inspr. Genl. of Prisons

To
T. Thumboo Chetty, Esqr.
Under Secretary. M.G.

G.R.S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

For File No. 40 of 1906

Serial No.

25 Draft submitted to 2nd Councillor for approval WS 14/12/06

26 Clean draft is sent up. I have slightly altered it. 15/12/06

5/8/07

31.12.06

27 R

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23 10·05

WS 18/12/06

29 December 07

WS 21/12/07

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 40 of 1906-07

Serial No. 3

Govt Orders No. 12644-57 dated 28/11/07 to the Asst Surgeon of Basavanahalli in Mysore District regarding the [illegible] of the Chief Court.

Animadverts on the conduct of the jail officers and officials for having detained the prisoner for 37 days and directs that Mr Melville should be suspended for 3 months and debarred from further promotion & Swamy and Lakshman Rao should also be suspended for 3 months and reduced to the next lower grade & directs that the severe displeasure of Govt should be communicated to Superintendent of the Central jail

Note—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—23 10-05

J 828

1906

From

The Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore Genl & Rev Dept

Dated 1st October 1906

Despatched 2nd do

Received

General No. 1616

No.

Enclosure No. One file

Forwards for information of Govt a file regarding the over detention of Prisoner No 9590 Siddey Gowda in the Bangalore Central Jail

2 J 828

No. 1276 C Office of the Inspr. Genl. of Prisons in Mysore.
J Suit file

Dated Bangalore, the 1st October 1906.
Encls

From F. no: 40 of 06

Lt.-Colonel. J.Smyth.,M.D., I.M.S., S. no: 1
Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore.

To

K.S.Chendrasekhara Aiyar Esquire., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,Genl.and Rev.Depts.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for the information of His Highness' Government a file regarding the detention of prisoner No.9590 Sidde Gowda in the Bangalore Central Jail

2. It will be seen that the prisoner was admitted to the Bangalore Central Jail on the 30th June 1906; that on the 27th July 1906, an order suspending sentence was received by the Superintendent; and that on 8th August 1906, an order of immediate release was received.

3. The suspension order was duly noted in the Register.

4. The release order was received by the Superintendent and initialled; it was then passed to the Chief Jailor who entered "Note" over his initials and passed it on to the 1st Assistant Jailor Surappa(the Head Clerk). This official duly noted in the "From" Register that the man is to be released. What next became of the order is doubtful. The Head Clerk, Surappa, says he gave it to his assistant for disposal. The latter flatly denies that he even saw it. However, the Munshi Lukshmana Rao acknowledged its receipt but does not know who gave it to him. He says he received the order and on referring to the Register misread the word

'suspended

"suspended" for "released", wrote the words " released on 27-7-06" on the order and then came and told the Head Clerk that the man had been released on 27th July 1906. The order now disappeared till 14th September 1906. I went to the Jail myself and could get no satisfactory explanation of his conduct from the Head Clerk. In my opinion however the mental state which led to the disappearance of the release order was brought about as follows:-

I. He duly received the release order and entered it in the From Register; II. the Munshi told him that the man had been already released; III. he became terrified at the idea of the man having been released before his time- which could only have occurred through a blunder, probably his own- and instead of reporting the supposed release to the Chief Jailor he said nothing about the matter in the hope that it would some how pass unnoticed.

5. I must here invite the attention of His Highness' Government to the peculiar procedure adopted by the releasing Court. The Sessions Judge's order to release the prisoner was issued on the 6th August 1906, and by next mail, the Court should have received the Superintendent's certificate that its orders had been carried out. But such certificate was not sent- and in fact has not yet been sent, yet the Court never made any enquiry as to why it was not sent or whether their order had been obeyed. If the Court had enquired, even a week after it should have received the certificate, why the certificate was not forthcoming, the Superintendent would have become aware of the detention of the prisoner and his detention for 39 days would have been impossible.

6. I have passed the following orders on the subject so far as it relates to the Jail officials:- that 1st Assistant Jailor (Head Clerk) Soorappa and Munshi Lukshmana Rao be each fined a month's pay and that the Chief Jailor

be

be censured.

7. On looking up precedent in such cases I find that there is only one such case on record in the office. In that case, a man was over detained some months, and the punishment awarded was the transfer of the guilty clerk to another Jail- to my mind a punishment erring on the side of leniencies.

8. The file of records may be obligingly returned when no longer required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M.D.,

Lt.-Colonel.,I.M.S.,

Inspector General of Prisons.

T 896

5

Chief Court of Mysore,

Bangalore, dated 10th October 1906.

From,

V. A. Rajaratna Mudaliar Esq.,

Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore.

To,

K. S. Chandrasekara Iyer Esq.,

Secretary to Government

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

A copy of letter No. 1416/J of the 1st October from the Inspector General of Prisons to Government has been communicated to the Chief Court.

(2) I am directed to forward for the information of Government a copy of letter No. 1040/194 from the Sessions Judge of Mysore with reference to the illegal detention of one Siddegowda in Jail for 37 days.

(3) I am ~~directed~~ to draw the attention of Government to the inconsistency between the facts as set out in para 5 of Colonel Smyth's letter and those given by the Sessions Judge.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

REGISTRAR.

6

From,

S. Venkatvaradan Iyengar Esq.,

Sessions Judge,

Mysore Division.

To,

V. A. Rajaratna Mudaliar Esq.,

Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore,

Bangalore.

Dated
Despatched 22nd September 06.

General No. I040
No. I94

Sir,

I have the honor to report for such orders as the Honourable Chief Court may deem fit to pass the following matter.

(2) In Hassan Criminal Appeal No. 26 of 05-06, the Accused Appellant Sidde gowda was ordered on the 6th ultimo (August) to be released forthwith. This order was forwarded to the Superintendent of the Central Jail Bangalore with No. 399/7 on the same day. In the usual course it must have reached him the next or the following day

(3) The usual direction to the Asstt: Sessions Judge, Hassan (who had passed the conviction) to recall his warrant was also forwarded on the IIth idem with No. 497/II3. He issued the usual order to the Jail Superintendent for the release of the Accused

with No. 66 dated I3th idem. On the 24th he also intimated the name and date of conviction of the prisoner to the Superintendent.

(4) The Superintendent did not give effect to the order communicated to him by this Court on the 6th idem, nor to the direction of the Asstt: Sessions Judge of the I3th and 24th idem. In docket No. I40I of the 6th instant (September) the Superintendent refused

to

to return the warrant on the plea that the sentence had only been suspended.

5. Thereupon the Assistant Sessions Judge reported the matter to this court and on my inviting the Superintendent's attention to the order forwarded on the 6th ultimo and asking to be informed of the circumstances under which the same was not given effect to(No.908/215 dated 12th instant),he has replied to say that the prisoner was releaed on receipt of this communication(No.1447 dated 17th instant).

6. It will thus be seen that instead of being released on the 7th or 8th of August last the prisoner was illegally confined till at least the 13th instant i.e. for a period of 37 days.

7. The Superintendent states that a serious mistake has occurred and he will hold an enquiry and report the same to the Inspector-General of Prisons. Though this court asked for information as to the circumstances under which the order passed in appeal was not immediately enforced,the Superintendent has not thought it fit to mention them.

8. The fact that the order of release passed according to law was ignored by the Jail authorities though this court and the Assistant Sessions Judge called attention to it,is a matter of serious importance as affecting the administration of Justice.

I have &c.,

Sd-. S. Venkatavaradan Iyengar,

Sessions Judge.

" Copy "

Proceedings of the Government of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Letter No.1416/J, dated the 1st October 1906, from the Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore regarding the over-detention in the Bangalore Central Jail for 37 days of prisoner Siddegowda, accused in Sessions case No.6 of 05-06 on the file of the Assistant Sessions Judge, Hassan, and appellant in criminal appeal No.26 of 05-06 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Hassan.

2. Letter No.1923/108 dated the 10th October 1906, from the Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore, on the same subject.

Order thereon No. J2644-5 dated 28-2-07
Pris 40-06-3.

The prisoner was convicted by the Assistant Sessions Judge, Hassan, on the 7th June 1906, and sentenced to 2 years' rigorous imprisonment and was admitted to the Central Jail on the 30th idem. On appeal, the Sessions Judge of Mysore first issued an order directing the suspension of the sentence, which was received in the Central Jail on the 27th July 1906, and, finally, when the appeal was decided, issued another order on the 6th August 1906, directing the prisoner's immediate release. This was received in the Jail on the 8th August 1906, but the prisoner was not actually released until after an illegal detention of 37 days,

9

i.e., on the 15th September 1906. The Inspector General states that the overdetention was due to gross carelessness on the part of the Jail officials, viz., the Acting Chief Jailor McGuire, Acting Deputy Jailor Surappa and Munshi Lakshman Rao and that he has censured the Jailor and ~~fine~~ fined the Acting Deputy Jailor and Munshi each one month's pay.

2. The facts set forth above disclose a ~~strking~~ striking instance of the ~~scandalous~~ loose manner in which the management is conducted ~~state of things allowed to prevail~~ in the Bangalore Central Jail. The Sessions Judge of Mysore sends an order directing the release of a prisoner whose sentence had already been suspended, but the order is trifled with, and tossed about from one person to another and no effect is given to it for 37 days; and though in the meantime a requisition was received from the Assistant Sessions Judge recalling the warrant, the Jail authorities instead of taking the trouble to see what had been done with the prisoner referred to in the warrant, carry on further correspondence with the Assistant Sessions Judge and the Sessions Judge under the erroneous idea that the man's sentence had only been suspended. It was not till the Sessions Judge called on the Superintendent of the Central Jail to explain why the prisoner had not been released that the error was discovered and that the prisoner was set free. Government consider that a more flagrant case of culpable carelessness and mismanagement could not be conceived

10

and this is aggravated by the circumstance that a prisoner ordered to be released was illegally detained for 37 days.

3. The Jail official primarily responsible for this mistake is the Acting Chief Jailor, whose duty when an order of release was received was to see that immediate effect was given to it. There was blundering on the part of the Deputy Jailor also who instead of looking into the matter personally left the warrant to be dealt with by a Clerk. The Clerk Lakshman Rao made a wrong endorsement on the warrant. The whole case discloses an utter want of all sense of responsibility from the Superintendent downwards. The Acting Chief Jailor Mcguire as primarily responsible should be suspended for one month and debarred from all promotion from his present position of Deputy Jailor. The then Deputy Jailor and now Head Clerk Surappa should be suspended for three months and at the end reduced to the next lower grade, and Munshi Lakshman Rao should also be suspended for 3 months and reduced to the next lower grade.

Govt are of opinion that the punishments awarded by the D.G of Prisons are inadequate & order the additional punishment as follows

5. Government, at the same time, cannot absolve the Superintendent of the Central Jail from blame in the case. His supervision must have been very slack for such an untoward incident to happen. He evidently relied too much on Surappa and did not take the trouble to verify things for himself. Government however think that it will be sufficient if their displeasure be

11

be communicated to him for the lax manner in which things are permitted to be done in the Central Jail, Bangalore.

Secretary.

3183

To

The Inspector General of Prisons in Mysore, with record.

The Registrar of the Chief Court,

(~~returning~~ the original records).

G.R.S. 28]

12

File No. 40 9
Serial No. 3

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
( )

, the 190

Date of issue _____

Signed by _____

READ.—

Letter No. 1416/9, dated the 1st October 1908, from the Supt General of Prisons in Mysore regarding the re-detention in the Bangalore Central Jail for 30 days of Sri Siddegowda, accused in Sessions Case No. 6/05-06 on the file of the Assistant Sessions Judge Hassan and appellant in ~~Siddah~~ Criminal appeal No. 26/05-06 on the file of the Sessions Judge Hassan

2. Letter No. 1523/108-9 dated 10th October 1908 from the Asst. Superintendent of Police, Chief Office, Mysore,

over

ORDER THEREON.—No.

SUBJECT

MGCPB—20,000—24-2-05

13

-. the same subject

Order Record:-

The prisoner was convicted by the Asst. Sessions Judge, Hassan, on the 9th June 06, and sentenced to 2 years rigorous imprisonment and was admitted to the Central Jail on the 20th idem. On appeal, the Sessions Judge of Hyderabad issued an order directing the suspension of the sentence, which was received in the Central Jail on the 27th July 1906, and, finally, when the appeal was decided & issued an order on the 6th August 1906 directing the prisoner's immediate release. This was received in the Jail on the 8th August 1906, but the prisoner was not actually released until ~~the 15th Sept 1906~~ on the 2nd Sept 06 after an illegal detention of 37 days. It is observed that this extremely discreditable incident is due to gross carelessness on the

Please see next page

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

The Asst. Surgeon states that the accidents ~~could have been avoided if the Sessions Court had, even after the release order, called for the Superintendent's certificate of release and that~~ was due to gross carelessness on the part of the jail officials viz the Asst. Chief Jailer Mr Swamy Subbarayappa and ~~Head Clerk~~ Lakshmana Rao paid that he has ~~perused~~ examined the jails and fined the ~~Head Clerk~~ A/S Dy Jailer and ~~Guard~~ Munshi each one month's pay.

2. ~~The above circumstances~~ facts set forth above disclose ~~is~~ a striking instance of the scandalous state of things allowed ~~by Warrant~~ in the Bangalore Central jail. The Sessions Judge of Mysore sends an order directing the release of a prisoner whose sentence had already been suspended, but the order is trifled with and tossed about from one person to another and no effect is given to it for 37 days, and in the meantime, although a requisition was received from the Assistant Sessions Judge recalling the warrant the jail authorities did not wake up to their faults; in fact,

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Continuation Sheet draft form)

Lakshmana Das who ~~Government~~ ~~regret to learn that he~~ did not exercise even ordinary care in the discharge of his duties ~~was suitable~~ ~~A man who misbehaved~~ ~~he has to~~ suspended for "wilful" ~~and not merely~~ Government opinion is ~~the opinion~~ that he should be dismissed from ~~the~~ service. A dismissal from service may perhaps Government ~~will hardly~~ be considered a punishment for his fault, but ~~I consider that~~ ~~insufficient if~~ he be degraded permanently to the next lower ~~grade~~ establishment of the Jail. I, at the same time, cannot altogether absolve the Superintendent of the Central Jail from blame in the case. ~~There~~ ~~I cannot think that~~ His supervision must have been ~~too~~ slack for such an outward ~~accident~~ incident to happen ~~and that he~~ relied too much on Sanappa and did not take the trouble to verify things for himself. Govt however ~~does~~ think ~~however~~ it will be sufficient ~~that~~ if Mr. Dis pleasure of the Govt be communicated to him for his ~~guidance~~ in which things are permitted to be done in the Central Jail, Bangalore

What is the next lower post? E

allowed — N

evidently

Govt however think it

MGCPB—30,000—5-4-05.

CR 6/1/06 To the Secretary to the Govt of India in the Revenue Department